REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June 3, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims, as presented, are respectfully requested.

1.   Response to Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ylitalo* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0085056). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the *Ylitalo* reference. Applicant discusses the *Ylitalo* reference and Applicant's claims in the following.

a.   Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

> A method for controlling printing performance of a printing device, comprising the steps of:
> *receiving identification of a desired printing performance from a user*;
> automatically determining which of several different printing parameters of the printing device to adjust to provide the desired printing performance; and
> *adjusting the printing parameters of the printing device as necessary to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ylitalo* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of

"receiving identification of a desired printing performance from a user" and "adjusting the printing parameters of the printing device as necessary to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited and emphasized above.

Rather, *Ylitalo* appears to disclose at most "automated techniques for selecting and/or adjusting printing parameters" based upon test pattern images received on a substrate. *See* para. 0017. Therefore, *Ylitalo* fails to teach or suggest "receiving identification of a desired printing performance <u>from a user</u>" and "adjusting the printing parameters of the printing device as necessary to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting <u>quality and speed</u> of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). For example, *Ylitalo* discloses that a "<u>computer</u> is used to determine which of the test pattern images exhibits optimal desired characteristics" and not a user. *See* para. 0017 (Emphasis added). Further, the automated methods taught by *Ylitalo* affect "image quality" but not print speed. *See, e.g.*, para. 0017. For at least this reason, *Ylitalo* fails to anticipate claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least the aforementioned reasons.

b.   Claims 2-9

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-9 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-9 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 2-9 should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 2-9, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable. For example, claim 3, <u>among others</u>, includes the feature "wherein the printing performance setting is received via a graphical user interface (GUI)," which is not taught or suggested by *Ylitalo*.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

c.   Claim 10

As provided in independent claim 10, Applicant claims:

A system for controlling printing performance of a printing device, comprising:

means for receiving identification of a desired printing performance from a user;

means for automatically determining which of several different printing parameters of the printing device. to adjust to provide the desired printing performance; and

means for adjusting the printing parameters of the printing device as necessary to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ylitalo* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of "means for receiving identification of a desired printing performance from a user" and "means for adjusting the printing parameters of the printing device as necessary to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited and emphasized above.

Rather, *Ylitalo* appears to disclose at most "automated techniques for selecting and/or adjusting printing parameters" based upon test pattern images received on a substrate. *See* para. 0017. Therefore, *Ylitalo* fails to teach or suggest "means for receiving identification of a desired printing performance <u>from a user</u>" and "means for adjusting the printing parameters of the printing device as necessary to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting <u>quality and speed</u> of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited in claim 10. (Emphasis added). For example, *Ylitalo* discloses that a "<u>computer</u> is used to determine which of the test pattern images exhibits optimal desired characteristics" and not a user. *See* para. 0017 (Emphasis added). Further, the automated methods taught by *Ylitalo* affect "image

-9-

quality" but not print speed. *See, e.g.*, para. 0017. For at least this reason, *Ylitalo* fails to anticipate claim 10.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn for at least the aforementioned reasons.

d.   Claims 11-15

Because independent claim 10 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 11-15 (which depend from independent claim 10) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 11-15 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 10. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 11-15 should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 11-15, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable. For example, claim 13, among others, includes the feature of a "graphical user interface (GUI) include[ing] an indication of a performance spectrum with high printing quality at one end of the spectrum and high print speed at another end of the spectrum," which is not taught or suggested by *Ylitalo*.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

e.   Claim 16

As provided in independent claim 16, Applicant claims:

> A printing device, comprising:
> a processing device;
> electrophotographic   imaging   components   with   which hardcopies can be created; and
> *a print control module configured to adjust printing parameters in response to a received identification of a desired printing performance from a user, wherein the printing parameters correspond to internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of printing performance of the printing device.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ylitalo* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a print control module configured to adjust printing parameters in response to a received identification of a desired printing performance from a user, wherein the printing parameters correspond to internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of printing performance of the printing device," as recited and emphasized above.

Rather, *Ylitalo* appears to disclose at most "automated techniques for selecting and/or adjusting printing parameters" based upon test pattern images received on a substrate. *See* para. 0017. Therefore, *Ylitalo* fails to teach or suggest "a print control module configured to adjust printing parameters in response to a received identification of a desired printing performance <u>from a user</u>, wherein the printing parameters correspond to internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting <u>quality and speed</u> of printing performance of the printing device," as recited in claim 16. (Emphasis added). For example, *Ylitalo* discloses that a "<u>computer</u> is used to determine which of the test pattern images exhibits optimal desired characteristics" and not a user. *See* para. 0017 (Emphasis added). Further, the automated methods taught by *Ylitalo* affect "image quality" but not print speed. *See, e.g.,* para. 0017. For at least this reason, *Ylitalo* fails to anticipate claim 16.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn for at least the aforementioned reasons.

f.   Claims 17-20

Because independent claim 16 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 17-20 (which depend from independent claim 16) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 17-20 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 16. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 17-20 should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 17-20, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable. For example, claim 19, <u>among others</u>, includes the feature "wherein the

print control module is configured to adjust at least one of font substitution and font bitmapping," which is not taught or suggested by *Ylitalo*.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

g.   Claim 21

As provided in independent claim 21, Applicant claims:

> A printing device driver configured to control printing performance of a printing device, comprising:
> *logic configured to receive identification of a desired printing performance from a user;*
> logic configured to automatically determine which of several different printing parameters of the printing device to adjust to provide the desired printing performance; and
> *logic configured to facilitate adjustment of the printing device printing parameters to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ylitalo* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of "logic configured to receive identification of a desired printing performance from a user" and "logic configured to facilitate adjustment of the printing device printing parameters to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited and emphasized above.

Rather, *Ylitalo* appears to disclose at most "automated techniques for selecting and/or adjusting printing parameters" based upon test pattern images received on a substrate. *See* para. 0017. Therefore, *Ylitalo* fails to teach or suggest "logic configured to receive identification of a desired printing performance from a user" and "logic configured to facilitate adjustment of the printing device printing parameters to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited in claim 21. (Emphasis added). For example, *Ylitalo* discloses that a "computer is used to determine which of the test

pattern images exhibits optimal desired characteristics" and not a user. *See* para. 0017 (Emphasis added). Further, the automated methods taught by *Ylitalo* affect "image quality" but not print speed. *See, e.g.*, para. 0017. For at least this reason, *Ylitalo* fails to anticipate claim 21.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn for at least the aforementioned reasons.

h.   Claims 22-25

Because independent claim 21 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 22-25 (which depend from independent claim 21) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 22-25 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 21. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 22-25 should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 22-25, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable. For example, claim 25, among others, includes the feature "wherein the printing parameters pertain to at least one of font substitution, font bitmapping, resolution down-sampling, data compression, I/O buffer size, masering buffer size, and jam recovery," which is not taught or suggested by *Ylitalo*.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

i.   Claim 26

As provided in independent claim 26, Applicant claims:

> Software for controlling printing performance of a printing device, the software being stored on a computer readable medium, comprising:
> *logic configured to receive identification of a desired printing performance from a user;*
> logic configured to automatically determine which of several different printing parameters of the printing device to adjust to provide the desired printing performance; and
> *logic configured to facilitate adjustment of the printing device printing parameters to provide the desired printing performance by*

> *changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ylitalo* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of "logic configured to receive identification of a desired printing performance from a user" and "logic configured to facilitate adjustment of the printing device printing parameters to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting quality and speed of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited and emphasized above.

Rather, *Ylitalo* appears to disclose at most "automated techniques for selecting and/or adjusting printing parameters" based upon test pattern images received on a substrate. *See* para. 0017. Therefore, *Ylitalo* fails to teach or suggest "logic configured to receive identification of a desired printing performance <u>from a user</u>" and "logic configured to facilitate adjustment of the printing device printing parameters to provide the desired printing performance by changing internal settings of the printing device, the internal settings including those affecting <u>quality and speed</u> of the printing performance of the printing device," as recited in claim 26. (Emphasis added). For example, *Ylitalo* discloses that a "<u>computer</u> is used to determine which of the test pattern images exhibits optimal desired characteristics" and not a user. *See* para. 0017 (Emphasis added). Further, the automated methods taught by *Ylitalo* affect "image quality" but not print speed. *See, e.g.*, para. 0017. For at least this reason, *Ylitalo* fails to anticipate claim 26.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 26 should be withdrawn for at least the aforementioned reasons.

j.   Claims 27-25

Because independent claim 21 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 22-25 (which depend from independent claim 21) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 22-25 contain all the elements and features of independent claim 21. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 22-25 should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 22-25, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable. For example, claim 28, <u>among others,</u> includes the feature of "a graphical user interface (GUI) configured to receive an identification of a printing performance setting," which is not taught or suggested by *Ylitalo*.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283